REMARKS

Claims in the case are 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 17-19 and 21-27, upon entry of this amendment. Claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 17 and 21-23 have been amended, and Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 14, 16 and 20 have been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 11 and 13 were cancelled previously in a Preliminary Amendment dated August 17, 2001. The claims have been amended as to form, e.g., by inserting indefinite and definite articles where appropriate, including indentation, and replacing "characterized in that" with --wherein--. Additional amendments to the claims will be discussed further herein.

Prior to the present amendment, the claims in the case were 2-10, 12, and 14-27, rather than "1-10, 12 and 14-27" recited on the Office Action Summary page. Claim 1 was cancelled in a Preliminary Amendment dated August 17, 2001.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the amendments herein and the following remarks.

The Markush language of the claims has been modified to more properly recite the members from which each of the alkaline earth metal sulfate and the oxide may be selected. In addition the claims have been amended herein to clearly recite the "oxide" as being other than the "alkaline earth metal sulfate."

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which they regard as their invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12 and 14-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b or e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over United States Patent No. 4,650,823 (**Krishnan et al**), United States Patent No. 4,713,408 (**Takahashi et al**), United States Patent No. 5,449,710 (**Umeda et al**) or United States Patent No. 6,369,141 B1 (**Ishii et al**), in view of United States Patent No. 3,919,167 (**Mark**), United States Patent No. 3,933,734 (**Mark et al**), United

States Patent No. 5,849,001 (**Torimae et al**) or United States Patent No. 5,910,560 (**Nagashima et al**). These rejections are respectfully traversed with regard to the amendments herein and the following remarks.

Krishnan et al disclose a thermoplastic molding composition which includes, a polycarbonate resin, a pigmenting amount of iron oxide, polytetrafluroethylene, sulfonic acid salts and sulfonates. See the abstract; column 5, line 1; and column 5, line 45 of Krishnan et al.

Krishnan et al do not disclose, teach or suggest the molding composition of Applicants' claims, which includes (c)(i) an alkaline earth metal sulfate having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of $MgSO_4$, $SrSO_4$ and $BaSO_4$; and/or (c)(ii) an oxide having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of GeO_2, PbO, PbO_2, CeO_2, Ce_2O_3, SnO, SnO_2, ZrO_2, HfO_2, Sc_2O_3 and La_2O_3.

Mark and Mark et al are cited in the Office Action to describe the sulfonic acid salts of Krishnan et al. Mark and Mark et al each disclose a flame retardant composition that includes a polycarbonate polymer, and metal salts of aromatic sulfonic acids (with Mark et al) or metal salts of heterocyclic sulfonic acids (with Mark). See the abstract and Table 1 of each of Mark and Mark et al.

Neither Mark nor Mark et al disclose, teach or suggest the molding composition of Applicants' claims, which includes (c)(i) an alkaline earth metal sulfate having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of $MgSO_4$, $SrSO_4$ and $BaSO_4$; and/or (c)(ii) an oxide having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of GeO_2, PbO, PbO_2, CeO_2, Ce_2O_3, SnO, SnO_2, ZrO_2, HfO_2, Sc_2O_3 and La_2O_3.

Takahashi et al disclose a composition that includes polybutylene terephthalate resin, a sulfonate anionic antistatic agent, oxidized polyolefin wax and silica. See the abstract and column 3, lines 13-19 of Takahashi et al.

Takahashi et al do not disclose, teach or suggest the molding composition of Applicants' claims, which includes (c)(i) an alkaline earth metal sulfate having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of $MgSO_4$, $SrSO_4$ and $BaSO_4$; and/or (c)(ii) an oxide having an average particle size of

up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of GeO_2, PbO, PbO_2, CeO_2, Ce_2O_3, SnO, SnO_2, ZrO_2, HfO_2, Sc_2O_3 and La_2O_3.

Umeda et al disclose a resin composition that includes, an aromatic polycarbonate resin, an alkali or alkaline-earth metal salt of a perfluoroalkane-sulfonic acid, an organopolysiloxane material, and a filler (e.g., TiO_2). See the abstract, and column 8, line 62 through column 9, line 3 of Umeda et al. Torimae and Nagashima et al are cited in the Office Action for purposes of showing that the TiO_2 disclosed by Umeda et al (i.e., Tipaque CR-60) has an average particle diameter of 0.2 μm. See column 13, lines 31-35 of Torimae et al, and column 10, lines 35-36 of Nagashima et al.

Umeda et al, Torimae and Nagashima et al, either alone or in combination do not disclose, teach or suggest the molding composition of Applicants' claims, which includes (c)(i) an alkaline earth metal sulfate having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of $MgSO_4$, $SrSO_4$ and $BaSO_4$; and/or (c)(ii) an oxide having an average particle size of up to 400 nm, and being selected from at least one of GeO_2, PbO, PbO_2, CeO_2, Ce_2O_3, SnO, SnO_2, ZrO_2, HfO_2, Sc_2O_3 and La_2O_3.

Included herewith is a certified English translation of the German priority document, German patent application number 199 07 831.9, which was filed on February 24, 1999. Ishii et al was filed on November 16, 1999, and was granted on April 9, 2002. In light of the certified English translation of the German priority document included herewith, Ishii et al is deemed to have been removed as a reference against Applicants' claims.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Krishnan et al, Mark et al, Mark, Takahashi et al, Umeda et al, Ishii et al, Torimae et al and Nagashima et al, either alone or in any combination, do not anticipate or render Applicants' present claims obvious. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants' presently pending claims are deemed to meet all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and to define an invention that is unanticipated, unovbious and hence, patentable, in light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the presently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James R. Franks
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,552

Bayer Polymers LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3808
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902
s:\kgb\jrf203am

APPENDIX

Certified English translation of German patent application number 199 07 831.9, Filed February 24, 1999.